

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,458	02/19/2004	Sung-Kyu Kang	71990/RSM	7458
7590 09/21/2005		EXAMINER		
Richard S. Milner			HRUSKOCI, PETER A	
Cooper & Dunh	nam LLP			
1185 Avenue of the Americas			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
New York, NY 10036			1724	
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary							
		10/783,458	KANG ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Peter A. Hruskoci	1724				
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sneet w	ith the correspondence address				
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	9 February 2004.					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application	on.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.	·				
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)🖂	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	priority documents have been	received in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bur	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.				
		•					
Attachmen	• •	-					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB.	/08) 5) ☐ Notice of I	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Pape S Patent and T	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1724

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the specification on page 14 lines 16 and 21, and page 15 line 1 "conditioned coal", and page 15 line 1 "conditioned oil" appear to be misdescriptive since a conditioning step for the coal and oil does not appear to be disclosed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1 "passing ... sieve" appears to be misdescriptive because water from the sewage sludge and not the enlarged agglomerates passes through the sieve. In claim 1 "selectively separate them", in claim 3 "conditioned coal and oil", in claims 4 and 6 "conditioned coal with oil", and in claim 5 "conditioned coal and conditioned oil" are vague and indefinite because it is unclear how these terms further limit the claims. Claims 2, and 7-9 depend from the above claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki 3,933,634 in view of Bhattacharyya et al. 5,051,487 and Mikhlin et al. 4,874,393. Seki disclose (see col. 3 line 39 through col. 7 line 47) a method for dewatering sewage sludge substantially as claimed. The claims differ from Seki by reciting that oil is supplied to the sludge, and a sieve is used to separate the agglomerates. Bhattacharyya et al. disclose (see col. 2 lines 1-16, and col. 8

Page 3

line 15 through col. 11 line 5) that it is known in the art to utilize emulsions including mineral oil, to aid in dewatering sewage sludge. Mikhlin et al. disclose (see col. 2 line 54 through col. 3 line 66) that it is known in the art to utilize a draining screen or sieve, to aid in dewatering coaloil agglomerates. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Seki by supplying oil and utilizing a sieve in view of the teachings of Bhattacharyya et al. and Mikhlin et al., to aid in dewatering the sewage sludge. With regard to claims 2, 4-7 and 9, it is submitted that Mikhlin et al. as applied above disclose that it is known in the art to utilize high and low speed stirring, first and second agglomeration steps, and the spray-washing of agglomerates, to aid in producing agglomerates used for fuel.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (571) 272-1160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

9/19/05